



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/608,501	06/30/2000	Vinu Sunderasan	COVDP008	2138

23689 7590 09/09/2005

Jung-hua Kuo  
Attorney At Law  
PO Box 3275  
Los Altos, CA 94024

EXAMINER

DUONG, THOMAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/608,501

Applicant(s)

SUNDERASAN ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas Duong

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/8/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. This office action is in response to the applicants Appeal Brief filed on June 10, 2005.  
*Claims 1-36* are presented for further consideration and examination.

### *Response to Argument*

2. Applicant's argument, see pages 4-6, filed June 10, 2005, with respect to *claims 1-36* have been fully considered and are persuasive. The previous rejection has been withdrawn.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. *Claims 1-6, 14-19, 24-29, and 34-36* are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gilles et al. (US006249578B1).
5. With regard to *claims 1, 14, and 24*, Gilles discloses,

- *electronically receiving a request message relating to the high speed network access service from a first service provider by a second service provider of the high speed network access service via a network, the first and second service providers cooperating to provide high speed network access service to an end subscriber; (Gilles, col.6, lines 31-50; col.7, lines 3-16)*

Gilles teaches “*gathering customer information during a pre-ordering process. This is typically preformed by the reseller in response to a customer inquiry or request for a service*” (Gilles, col.6, lines 31-34); and “*once validated, the information is communicated from the reseller to the wholesaler... This may be accomplished using a dedicated or direct connection between the reseller and the wholesaler*” (Gilles, col.7, lines 3-6). Hence, Gilles anticipates sending a request for service from the reseller of the network to the wholesaler of the network responding to the end user’s request.

- *processing the request message from the first service provider automatically upon the receiving using a computer system to automatically generate a response message to the request message by the second service provider; and (Gilles, col.7, line 17 – col.8, line 30; col.10, lines 33-53; col.13, line 65 – col.14, line 11)*

Gilles teaches of “*the appropriate information is then automatically transferred to the wholesaler’s internal order system as represented by blocks 486 and 488.*

*The order is processed and a response is generated, translated using the standard transaction set, and transmitted to the reseller*” (Gilles, col.14, lines 4-8). Hence, Gilles anticipates automatically processing the request message from

Art Unit: 2145

the reseller and automatically generating a response from the wholesaler and transmitting the response to the reseller.

- *electronically transmitting the response message from the second service provider to the first service provider via the network automatically upon completion of the processing, (Gilles, col.7, line 17 – col.8, line 30; col.10, lines 33-53; col.13, line 65 – col.14, line 11)*

Gilles teaches of *"the appropriate information is then automatically transferred to the wholesaler's internal order system as represented by blocks 486 and 488.*

*The order is processed and a response is generated, translated using the standard transaction set, and transmitted to the reseller"* (Gilles, col.14, lines 4-8). Hence, Gilles anticipates automatically processing the request message from the reseller and automatically generating a response from the wholesaler and transmitting the response to the reseller.

- *wherein the processing of the request message by the second service provider utilizes a predefined request document tag definition and the generating of the response message by the second service provider utilizes a predefined response document tag definition. (Gilles, col.1, lines 23-44; col.2, lines 53-67; col.6, line 56 – col.7, line 2; col.11, lines 5-7; col.14, lines 36-39)*

Gilles teaches of *"the development of transaction sets particularly suited for telecommunications services and products provides a standard method for electronic ordering where external access to dynamic data is required"* (Gilles, col.2, lines 59-63). According to Gilles, *"the CSR [Customer Service Record] interface uses the Flexible Communications Interface Format (FCIF) developed by Bellcore. This format uses a tag value methodology"* (Gilles, col.11, lines 5-7).

6. With regard to claims 2, 15 and 25, Gilles discloses,

- *wherein the processing of the request message determines a type with which the request message is associated, the type is selected from the group consisting of service availability, DSL service, order entry, order status, order summary, trouble ticket entry, trouble ticket status, and trouble ticket summary (Gilles, col.5, lines 3-26; col.7, line 61 – col.8, line 30)*

7. With regard to claims 3-6, 16-19, and 26-29, Gilles discloses,

- *wherein the processing of the request message utilizes the predefined request document tag definition corresponding to the request message type. (Gilles, col.5, lines 3-26; col.7, line 61 – col.8, line 30)*
- *wherein the generating of the response message generates the response message in conformity to the predefined response document tag definition corresponding to the response message type and associates the response message with the request message type. (Gilles, col.5, lines 3-26; col.7, line 61 – col.8, line 30)*
- *wherein the processing of the request message includes determining from the request message values for request parameters corresponding to the message type. (Gilles, col.5, lines 3-26; col.7, line 61 – col.8, line 30)*
- *wherein the generating of the response message includes associating the response message with said message type and incorporating into the response message values for response parameters corresponding to said message type. (Gilles, col.5, lines 3-26; col.7, line 61 – col.8, line 30)*

8. With regard to claims 34-36, Gilles discloses,
- *wherein the processing of the request message utilizes the predefined request document tag definition corresponding to the request message type.* (Gilles, abstract; col.7, lines 35-51)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 7-13, 20-23, and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilles et al. (US006249578B1) and in view of Chen et al. (US006507856B1).

11. With regard to claims 7 and 8, Gilles disclose,

See *claim 1* rejection as detailed above.

However, Gilles does not explicitly disclose,

- *wherein, where the request message includes at least one sub-request, the generating of the response message includes generating the response message with at least one sub-response, each sub-response corresponding to one of at least one sub-request.*

Art Unit: 2145

- *wherein the generating of the response message includes associating each sub-response with a identification code associated with the corresponding sub-request.*

Chen teaches,

- *wherein, where the request message includes at least one sub-request, the generating of the response message includes generating the response message with at least one subresponse, each sub-response corresponding to one of at least one sub-request (Chen, col.2, lines 29-42; fig.7-8; col.3, line 37 - col.4, line 39)*
- *wherein the generating of the response message includes associating each sub-response with a identification code associated with the corresponding sub-request. (Chen, col.2, lines 29-42; col.3, line 37 - col.4, line 39; fig.7-8)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen with the teachings of Gilles to enable additional data retrieval or formatting implementations to be quickly and easily added into the computing environment, providing greater flexibility in the manner in which data can be presented, and possible increasing overall system throughput and alleviating potential processing bottlenecks. Furthermore, it makes changes less error-prone because it is more likely that all the code needing change will be located, and will therefore be changed.

12. With regard to claims 9, 20 and 30, Gilles and Chen disclose,

- *wherein the processing of the request message includes decoding the request message from extensible markup language (XML) and the generating of the*



Art Unit: 2145

*response message includes encoding the response messages in XML (Chen, col.2, lines 29-42; col.3, line 37 - col.4, line 39; fig.7-8)*

13. With regard to claims 10-13, 21-23 and 31-33, Gilles and Chen disclose,
- *wherein each predefined response and request document tag definition is associated with a message document header tag definition, corresponding one of a request and response message header tag definition and a message body tag definition (Chen, col.2, lines 29-42; col.3, line 37 - col.4, line 39; fig.7-8)*

#### **Response to Arguments**


14. Applicant's arguments with respect to *claims 1-36* have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### **Conclusion**

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Duong whose telephone number is 571/272-3911. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal D. Dharia can be reached on 571/272-3880. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571/273-8300 for regular communications and 571/273-8300 for After Final communications.

Thomas Duong (AU2145)

September 2, 2005

  
PATRICE WINDER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER